UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/090,697	03/04/2002	Sanjay S. Singal	62357-8010.US01	4790

22918   7590   10/17/2008
PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. BOX 1208
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1208

EXAMINER
EKPO, NNENNA NGOZI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2425	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _05 August 2008_.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-11 and 26-39_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _12-25_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-11, 26-39_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgement

1.   This Office Action is responsive to the arguments filed on August 05, 2008.

Claim Objections

2.   Previous objections to the claims are withdrawn in view of Applicant's

amendment filed on August 05, 2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3.   Previous *35 USC § 101* rejections to the claims are withdrawn in view of

Applicant's amendment filed on August 05, 2008.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-39 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   **Claims 1, 2, 5-8, and 26-29** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Srivastava et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,549,922) in view of Fleischman

(U.S. Patent No. 6,507,847), Grapes (U.S. Patent No. 6,446,130) and Vanhoof et al.

(U.S. Patent No. 6,298,049).

Regarding **claims 1 and 26**, Srivastava et al. discloses a file stored in a

computer readable medium having a file format for distributing media content from a

server computer to a client computer in the form of a transfer file, the file format

comprising:

a header section, said header section including media type information (title of

the media) (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 5, lines 24-26, col. 6, line 1, table on

cols. 5 and 6), bit rate information describing a bit rate at which a media asset plays out

on the client computer (bit rate of the media in bits/second) (see cited portion, but not

limited to table on cols. 5 and 6), information indicating the time duration of the media

asset (duration in seconds of the media) (see cited portion, but not limited to table on

cols. 5 and 6), and size information for various portions of the transfer file (size of the

media) (see cited portion, but not limited to table on cols. 5 and 6) including an index file

size information (see cols. 5 and 6 (video frame size (in bytes))).

However, Srivastava et al. fails to specifically disclose an asset metadata

section, said asset metadata section including a source host name, a source asset

identifier, and a value indicating a number of plays of the media asset can be played out

on the client computer to reduce negotiation between the server computer and the client

computer and to facilitate a point-to-point or point-to-multipoint distribution of media

content.

Fleischman discloses an asset metadata section, said asset metadata section

including a source host name (source) (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 3, lines

3-5), a source asset identifier (indexes) (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 2, line 67-col. 3, lines 1-3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Srivastava et al.'s invention with the above mentioned limitation as taught by Fleischman for the advantage of maintaining a history database.

However, Srivastava et al. and Fleischman fail to specifically disclose a value indicating a number of plays of the media asset can be played out on the client computer to reduce negotiation between the server computer and the client computer and to facilitate a point-to-point or point-to-multipoint distribution of media content.

Grapes disclose a value indicating a number of plays of the media asset can be played out on the client computer (see col. 10, lines 39-40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Srivastava et al. and Fleischman's invention with the above mentioned limitation as taught by Grapes for the advantage of notifying a user on how many times contents are played.

However, Srivastava et al., Fleischman and Grapes fail to specifically disclose reducing negotiation between the server computer and the client computer and to facilitate a point-to-point or point-to-multipoint distribution of media content.

Vanhoof et al. discloses reducing negotiation between the server computer and the client computer and to facilitate a point-to-point or point-to-multipoint distribution of media content (see col. 4, lines 43-col. 5, lines 32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Srivastava et al., Fleischman and Grapes invention with the above mentioned limitation as taught by Vanhoof et al. for the advantage of reducing traffic negotiation between providers and terminals.

Regarding **claims 2 and 27**, Srivastava et al., Fleischman, Grapes and Vanhoof et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claims 1 and 26*). Srivastava et al. discloses the file wherein the file format further comprising media content, said media content including the media asset described by the header section (title of the media) (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 5, lines 24-26, col. 6, line 1, table on cols. 5 and 6) and the asset metadata section (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 1, lines 62-col. 2, lines 7).

Regarding **claims 7 and 8**, Srivastava et al., Fleischman, Grapes and Vanhoof et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claims 1 and 2*). Srivastava et al. discloses the file wherein the media content comprises a movie and the user metadata includes a director name (director of the movie) (see cited portion, but not limited to table on cols. 7 and 8), plot synopsis (summary) (see col. 2, lines 56-65), and actor names (movie cast, names of the performers in the movie) (see cited portion, but not limited to table on cols. 7 and 8).

Regarding **claims 5 and 6**, Srivastava et al., Fleischman, Grapes and Vanhoof et

al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claims 1 and 2*). Grapes

discloses the file wherein the file format further comprising a user metadata section,

said user metadata including information that can be presented to a user (see cited

portion, but not limited to col. 9, lines 66-col. 10, lines 54).

Regarding **claims 28 and 29**, Srivastava et al., Fleischman, Grapes and Vanhoof

et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claims 1 and 26*). Srivastava

et al. discloses an extractor module retrieves asset metadata from a media asset

database, media content from a file system, and user metadata from a user metadata

database, and assembles them into the transfer file (see abstract, col. 2, lines 45-65)

7.   **Claims 3-4** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Srivastava et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,549,922), Fleischman (U.S. Patent No. 6,507,847),

Grapes (U.S. Patent No. 6,446,130) and Vanhoof et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,049) as

applied to *claims 1 and 2* above, and further in view of Jaeger, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No.

6,904,524).

Regarding **claims 3 and 4**, Srivastava et al., Fleischman, Grapes and Vanhoof et

al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claims 1 and 2*). However,

Srivastava et al., Fleischman, Grapes and Vanhoof et al. fail to specifically disclose the

file format further comprising a signature that identifies the file format to a client

computer.

Jaeger, Jr. et al. discloses the file wherein the file format further comprising a signature that identifies the file format to a client computer (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 5, lines 55-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Srivastava et al., Fleischman, Grapes and Vanhoof et al.'s invention with the above mentioned limitation as taught by Jaeger, Jr. et al. for the advantage of identifying the client computer.

8.   **Claim 9** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srivastava et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,549,922), Fleischman (U.S. Patent No. 6,507,847), Grapes (U.S. Patent No. 6,446,130) and Vanhoof et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,049) as applied to *claim 2* above, and further in view of Oguz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,771,703).

Regarding **claim 9**, Srivastava et al., Fleischman, Grapes and Vanhoof et al. discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 2*). However, Srivastava et al., Fleischman, Grapes and Vanhoof et al. fail to specifically disclose the file wherein the media content is presented in an MPEG format and the header section specifies a fast forward/rewind file size.

Oguz et al. discloses the file wherein the media content is presented in an MPEG format and the header section specifies a fast forward/rewind file size (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 31, lines 42-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Srivastava et al., Fleischman, Grapes and

Vanhoof et al.'s invention with the above mentioned limitation as taught by Oguz et al.

for the advantage of fast forwarding or rewinding a multimedia content.

9.   **Claim 10** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Srivastava et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,549,922), Fleischman (U.S. Patent No. 6,507,847),

Grapes (U.S. Patent No. 6,446,130) and Vanhoof et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,049) as

applied to *claim 2* above, and further in view of Suzuki et al. (U.S. Patent No.

6,771,703).

Regarding **claim 10**, Srivastava et al., Fleischman, Grapes and Vanhoof et al.

discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 2*). However, Srivastava et

al., Fleischman, Grapes and Vanhoof et al. fail to specifically disclose the file format

wherein the media content is presented in an MPEG format.

Suzuki et al. discloses the file format wherein the media content is presented in

an MPEG format (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 6, lines 35-54, col. 7, lines 56-

59).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify Srivastava et al., Fleischman, Grapes and

Vanhoof et al.'s invention with the above mentioned limitation as taught by Suzuki et al.

for the advantage of users easily adding new objects such as new scenes or subtitles to

content possessed by them.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Srivastava et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,549,922), Fleischman (U.S. Patent No. 6,507,847),

Grapes (U.S. Patent No. 6,446,130) and Vanhoof et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,049) as

applied to *claim 1* above, and further in view of Oguz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,771,703)

and Suzuki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,771,703).

Regarding **claim 11**, Srivastava et al., Fleischman, Grapes and Vanhoof et al.

discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claim 1*). Srivastava et al. discloses

the file wherein the file format further comprising media content, said media content

including the media asset described by the header section (title of the media) (see cited

portion, but not limited to col. 5, lines 24-26, col. 6, line 1, table on cols. 5 and 6) and the

asset metadata section (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 1, lines 62-col. 2, lines

7), the media content comprises a movie and the user metadata includes a director

name (director of the movie) (see cited portion, but not limited to table on cols. 7 and 8),

plot synopsis (summary) (see col. 2, lines 56-65), and actor names (movie cast, names

of the performers in the movie) (see cited portion, but not limited to table on cols. 7 and

8).

However, Srivastava et al., Fleischman, Grapes and Vanhoof et al. fail to

specifically disclose a signature that identifies the file format to a client computer; a user

metadata section, said user metadata including information that can be presented to a

user; the media content is presented in an MPEG format and the header section

specifies a fast forward/rewind file size.

Jaeger, Jr. et al. discloses the file wherein the file format further comprising a signature that identifies the file format to a client computer (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 5, lines 55-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Srivastava et al. and Fleischman's invention with the above mentioned limitation as taught by Jaeger, Jr. et al. for the advantage of a user to view and review the metadata content.

However, Srivastava et al., Fleischman, Grapes, Vanhoof et al. and Jaeger, Jr. et al. fail to specifically disclose the media content is presented in an MPEG format and the header section specifies a fast forward/rewind file size.

Oguz et al. discloses the header section specifies a fast forward/rewind file size (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 31, lines 42-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Srivastava et al., Fleischman, Grapes, Vanhoof et al. and Jaeger, Jr. et al.'s invention with the above mentioned limitation as taught by Oguz et al. for the advantage of fast forwarding or rewinding a multimedia content.

However, Srivastava et al., Fleischman, Grapes, Vanhoof et al., Jaeger, Jr. et al. and Oguz et al. fail to specifically disclose the file format wherein the media content is presented in an MPEG format.

Suzuki et al. discloses the file format wherein the media content is presented in

an MPEG format (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 6, lines 35-54, col. 7, lines 56-

59).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify Srivastava et al., Fleischman, Grapes,

Vanhoof et al., Jaeger, Jr. et al. and Oguz et al.'s invention with the above mentioned

limitation as taught by Suzuki et al. for the advantage of users easily adding new objects

such as new scenes or subtitles to content possessed by them.

10.   **Claims 30 and 35** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Srivastava et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,549,922) in view of Fleischman (U.S. Patent

No. 6,507,847), Jaeger, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,904,524), Vanhoof et al. (U.S.

Patent No. 6,298,049), Grapes (U.S. Patent No. 6,446,130) and Chellis et al. (U.S.

Patent No. 6,901,446).

Regarding **claims 30 and 35**, Srivastava et al. discloses a header section, said

header section including media type information (title of the media) (see cited portion,

but not limited to col. 5, lines 24-26, col. 6, line 1, table on cols. 5 and 6), bit rate

information describing a bit rate at which a media asset plays out on the client computer

(bit rate of the media in bits/second) (see cited portion, but not limited to table on cols. 5

and 6), information indicating the time duration of the media asset (duration in seconds

of the media) (see cited portion, but not limited to table on cols. 5 and 6), and size

information for various portions of the transfer file (size of the media) (see cited portion,

but not limited to table on cols. 5 and 6) including an index file size information (see

cols. 5 and 6 (video frame size (in bytes))).

However, Srivastava et al. fails to specifically disclose a signature indicating the

format of the transfer file, an asset metadata section describing media asset content,

said asset metadata section including a source host name, a source asset identifier,

and a value indicating a number of plays of the media asset can be played out on the

client computer to reduce negotiation between the server computer and the client

computer and to facilitate a point-to-point or point-to-multipoint distribution of media

content, media content that is capable of being displayed to a user at the at least one

client computer, user metadata that describes the media content and is capable of

being displayed to the user, the transfer file format being organized to include the asset

metadata section describing media asset content that is usable by a media player

program on the client computer to eliminate time consuming negotiation between client

computer and server computer and provide a more efficient transmission of media asset

content from the server computer to at least one client computer, the transfer file

informing each client computer of what client computer resources, including network

connection bandwidth, client computer processing speed, and memory size that must

be reserved or allocated for the incoming transfer file media asset.

Fleischman discloses an asset metadata section describing media asset content,

said asset metadata section including a source host name (source) (see cited portion,

but not limited to col. 3, lines 3-5), a source asset identifier (indexes) (see cited portion,

but not limited to col. 2, line 67-col. 3, lines 1-3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Srivastava et al.'s invention with the above mentioned limitation as taught by Fleischman for the advantage of maintaining a history database.

However, Srivastava et al. and Fleischman fail to specifically disclose a signature indicating the format of the transfer file, reducing negotiation between the server computer and the client computer and to facilitate a point-to-point or point-to-multipoint distribution of media content, media content that is capable of being displayed to a user at the at least one client computer, user metadata that describes the media content and is capable of being displayed to the user, the transfer file format being organized to include the asset metadata section describing media asset content that is usable by a media player program on the client computer to eliminate time consuming negotiation between client computer and server computer and provide a more efficient transmission of media asset content from the server computer to at least one client computer, the transfer file informing each client computer of what client computer resources, including network connection bandwidth, client computer processing speed, and memory size that must be reserved or allocated for the incoming transfer file media asset.

Jaeger, Jr. et al. discloses a signature indicating the format of the transfer file (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 5, lines 55-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Srivastava et al. and Fleischman's invention

with the above mentioned limitation as taught by Jaeger, Jr. et al. for the advantage of identifying the client computer.

However, Srivastava et al., Fleischman and Jaeger, Jr. et al. fail to specifically disclose reducing negotiation between the server computer and the client computer and to facilitate a point-to-point or point-to-multipoint distribution of media content, media content that is capable of being displayed to a user at the at least one client computer, user metadata that describes the media content and is capable of being displayed to the user, the transfer file format being organized to include the asset metadata section describing media asset content that is usable by a media player program on the client computer to eliminate time consuming negotiation between client computer and server computer and provide a more efficient transmission of media asset content from the server computer to at least one client computer, the transfer file informing each client computer of what client computer resources, including network connection bandwidth, client computer processing speed, and memory size that must be reserved or allocated for the incoming transfer file media asset.

Vanhoof et al. discloses reducing negotiation between the server computer and the client computer and to facilitate a point-to-point or point-to-multipoint distribution of media content (see col. 4, lines 43-col. 5, lines 32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Srivastava et al., Fleischman and Jaeger, Jr. et al.'s invention with the above mentioned limitation as taught by Vanhoof et al. for the advantage of reducing traffic negotiation between providers and terminals.

However, Srivastava et al., Fleischman, Jaeger, Jr. et al. and Vanhoof et al. fail to specifically disclose media content that is capable of being displayed to a user at the at least one client computer, user metadata that describes the media content and is capable of being displayed to the user, the transfer file format being organized to include the asset metadata section describing media asset content that is usable by a media player program on the client computer to eliminate time consuming negotiation between client computer and server computer and provide a more efficient transmission of media asset content from the server computer to at least one client computer, the transfer file informing each client computer of what client computer resources, including network connection bandwidth, client computer processing speed, and memory size that must be reserved or allocated for the incoming transfer file media asset.

Grapes discloses a value indicating a number of plays of the media asset can be played out on the client computer (see col. 10, lines 39-40),

media content that is capable of being displayed to a user at the at least one client computer (see cited portion, but not limited to abstract, lines 11-15),

user metadata that describes the media content and is capable of being displayed to the user (see cited portion, but not limited to col. 9, lines 66-col. 10. lines 64),

the transfer file format being organized to include the asset metadata section describing media asset content that is usable by a media player program on the client computer (see cited portion, but not limited to fig 4, col. 9, lines 66-col. 11. lines 7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Srivastava et al., Fleischman, Jaeger, Jr. et al. and Vanhoof et al.'s invention with the above mentioned limitation as taught by Grapes for the advantage of notifying a user on how many times contents are played.

However, Srivastava et al., Fleischman, Jaeger, Jr. et al., Vanhoof et al. and Grapes fail to specifically disclose the transfer file informing each client computer of what client computer resources, including network connection bandwidth, client computer processing speed, and memory size that must be reserved or allocated for the incoming transfer file media asset.

Chellis et al. discloses the transfer file informing each client computer of what client computer resources, including network connection bandwidth, client computer processing speed, and memory size that must be reserved or allocated for the incoming transfer file media asset (see col. 9, lines 3-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Srivastava et al., Fleischman, Jaeger, Jr. et al., Vanhoof et al. and Grapes invention with the above mentioned limitation as taught by Chellis et al. for the advantage of allocating the appropriate bandwidth.

11.   **Claims 31-34, 36-39** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srivastava et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,549,922), Fleischman (U.S. Patent No. 6,507,847), Jaeger, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,904,524), Vanhoof et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,049), Grapes (U.S. Patent No. 6,446,130) and Chellis et al. (U.S. Patent No.

6,901,446) as applied to claims 30 and 35 and further in view of Lecheler (U.S Patent

No. 6,308,209).   Regarding **claims 31 and 36**, Srivastava et al., Fleischman,

Jaeger, Jr. et al., Vanhoof et al., Grapes and Chellis et al. discloses everything claimed

as applied above (*see claims 30 and 35*). Chellis et al. discloses allocating client

computer resources required for the various parts of the transfer file (see col. 3, lines

60-col. 4, lines 27).

However, Srivastava et al., Fleischman, Jaeger, Jr. et al., Vanhoof et al., Grapes

and Chellis et al. fail to specifically disclose parsing by each of the plurality of client

computers so that the client computers can communicate without a negotiation with the

server computer.

Lecheler discloses parsing by each of the plurality of client computers so that the

client computers can communicate without a negotiation with the server computer (see

col. 2, lines 9-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify Srivastava et al., Fleischman, Jaeger, Jr. et

al., Vanhoof et al., Grapes and Chellis et al.'s invention with the above mentioned

limitation as taught by Lecheler for the advantage of communicating with the other

computers without negotiating with the server.

Regarding **claims 32 and 37**, Srivastava et al., Fleischman, Jaeger, Jr. et al.,

Vanhoof et al., Grapes, Chellis et al. and Lecheler discloses everything claimed as

applied above (*see claims 31 and 36*). Jaeger, Jr. et al. discloses wherein signature identifies the transfer file format (see col. 5, lines 55-65).

Srivastava et al. discloses permitting identification by each client computer of the remaining portions of the transfer file including the header section (see col. 5, lines 24-col. 6, lines 21).

Regarding **claims 33 and 38**, Srivastava et al., Fleischman, Jaeger, Jr. et al., Vanhoof et al., Grapes, Chellis et al. and Lecheler discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claims 32 and 37*). Grapes disclose wherein the header section identifies client computer resources including the size of the asset metadata (407), media content (401) (see fig 4). Chellis et al. discloses user metadata (see col. 4, lines 9-27).

Regarding **claims 33 and 38**, Srivastava et al., Fleischman, Jaeger, Jr. et al., Vanhoof et al., Grapes, Chellis et al. and Lecheler discloses everything claimed as applied above (*see claims 32 and 37*). Grapes disclose wherein transfer file header section identification of client computer resources including the sizes of the asset metadata (407), media content (401).

Chellis et al. discloses user metadata permits allocation of resources on each client computer as well as in an asset metadata database, in a user metadata database, and in a user file system (see col. 4, lines 9-58).

Conclusion

12.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nnenna N. Ekpo whose telephone number is 571-270-1663. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30 AM-5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Pendleton can be reached on 571-272-7527. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nnenna N. Ekpo/
Examiner
October 13, 2008.

/Brian T. Pendleton/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2623